

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are independent claims. Claims 1-30 stand rejected. Applicants herein amend claim 1 and 11. No new matter has been added. Further review and consideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bernstein et al. (“The Microsoft Repository”) in view of Bernstein v2 (“The Microsoft Repository Version 2 and Open Information Model”).

With respect to claim 1, in the Office Action the Examiner stated that “preventing a Holding Relationship between the source Item and the target Item if an Embedding Relationship currently exists between the source Item and the target Item, in order to establish the relationship between the plurality of items within the computer system” is taught by ‘workspace model’ section 6.3, page 15 paragraph 2-3 of Bernstein v2. (Office Action at p. 4). In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that since “there can be at most one version of an object in each workspace ... if a workspace implements one version of an object, then the [sic] application would prevent a Holding Relationship between two objects of the same version.” (Office Action at p. 4). Applicants submit that the Examiner’s argument “[t]hus, if a workspace implements one version of an object, then the application would prevent a *Holding Relationship between two Objects*” (Emphasis added) is a conclusory statement not supported by anything taught or suggested in the reference. Bernstein v2 states that a version is historical state of an object (Bernstein v2 at p. 13), a workspace is a “virtual repository that contains a subset of [] objects” and that only one version of an object can exist in a workspace (Bernstein v2 at p. 15). This does not however teach or suggest “preventing a Holding Relationship between the source Item and the target Item if an Embedding Relationship currently exists between the source Item and the target Item.”

Applicants additionally submit that Bernstein v2 fails to teach or suggest preventing the formation of a specific type of relationship if a holding relationship exists. Claim 1

recites “preventing a Holding Relationship between the source Item and the target Item *if an Embedding Relationship currently exists* between the source Item and the target Item.” (Emphasis added). Applicants submit that there is nothing in Bernstein v2 that teaches or suggests that the existence of a version relationship between a source and a target, regardless as to whether the source or target is in a workspace, is something that prevents a holding relationship from existing between the source and the target. Since each and every element is not taught or suggested by the combination of references, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 1.

Insomuch as claims 2 – 10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, they too patentably define over the combination of references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration to the rejections of claims 2 – 10.

Independent claim 21 recites similar elements to claim 1, and patentably define over the combination of references for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 21.

Insomuch as claims 22 – 30 depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the combination of references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration to the rejections of claims 22 – 30.

With respect to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references fails to teach or suggest at least “Embedding Relationships that enable modeling of compound Items, wherein a target Item of an Embedding Relationship can be manipulated within the context of the source Item.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 11.

Insomuch as claims 12 – 20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11 they too patentably define over the combination of references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration to the rejections of claims 12 – 20.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1752/302730.01
Application No.: 10/646,645
Office Action Dated: October 3, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance of all the claims.

Date: January 3, 2008

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439